

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-8 are now present in the application. Claims 1-6 have been amended and claims 7-8 have been added. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are independent. The Abstract of Disclosure has been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings Objections

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), since the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant submits that the mounting contacting area (claim 1) and the internal sealable structure (claim 2) are clearly illustrated in the drawings.

Referring to Figure 2, the element 32 clearly shows "a mounting contacting area that slants toward the front face and runs from the central part thereof to the periphery" as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the mounting contact area is the surface that is in contact with the film valve body. In addition, the internal sealable structure of claim 2 is clearly shown in Figures 4 and 7.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's drawing objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawing objection are therefore respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification stands objected to since the abstract of the disclosure is not in proper form. As the Examiner will note, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended to be in conformance with U.S. practice. Therefore, the specification objection has been obviated.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, the claims have been carefully reviewed and revised, taking into consideration the specific deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parman, U.S. Patent No. 4,565,214. Claims 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richison et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,147,272 in view of Parman. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a an evacuable valve, wherein a combination of elements is recited including the recitations “a valve body covering, including a valve body press foot extending from the back face of the valve body covering, is mounted to the valve seat portion, together with the valve body” and “the valve body press foot embraces the central portion of the valve blades of the valve body, and extends from a central portion of each valve blade toward a circumferential direction.” Support for the above combination of elements can be found in the specification at page 9, lines 15-37, Figure 2 and Figure 3(A). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the Parman reference relied on by the Examiner.

Parman discloses a valve assembly combination of a valve member 2 with air-through portion 11, a flapper valve 3 disposed on the body member 2 and a valve backer 1. Referring to Figure 2 of Parman, the back face of the valve backer 1 contacts the flapper valve 3. However Parman fails to disclose that the valve backer 1 includes a press foot that “extends from the back face” of the valve backer 1 as recited in the present invention. In view of this, the Parman reference fails to anticipate independent claim 1 of the present invention.

With regard to dependent claims 2-6, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependence on independent claim 1, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on the Richison et al. reference, this reference also fails to disclose a press foot that extends from a back face of a valve body covering. Therefore, this reference fails to make up for the deficiencies of Parman.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 7-8 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent on independent claim 2, and are allowable due to their dependence on independent claim 1, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 7-8 are therefore not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 7-8 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

An evacuable valve does not need a separate member such as a covering for closing an air-through portion and has a small portion that projects therefrom. A valve body in the evacuable valve can securely contact the valve body contacting portion and close an air-through portion where the valve body covers, thereby keeping the evacuated state for a long period of time. A valve seat portion of the back face of an evacuable valve can at least partly rest in the depressed area of the front face of the other valve, thereby being able to pile up the evacuable valves. In the production process of evacuable bags that are provided with the evacuable valve, piling and storage of the evacuable valves do not need excessive space and much effort.